

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 3. This sheet 3 of 6 replaces the original sheet 3 of 6. In Figure 3, the label "(Prior Art)" has been deleted. As stated in the specification as filed, page 10, lines 8-9, Figure 3 illustrates a computer network that includes two access devices configured according to an embodiment of the invention.

Attachment:        Replacement Sheet

### **REMARKS**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed 08/22/2006. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

#### ***Drawings***

Applicant has provided a replacement sheet including Figure 3. In Figure 3, the label "(Prior Art)" has been deleted. As stated in the specification as filed, page 10, lines 8-9, Figure 3 illustrates a computer network that includes two access devices configured according to an embodiment of the invention.

#### ***Specification***

Applicant has amended the specification to include a claim of priority to U.S. application Ser. No. 08/684,130. Applicant respectfully points out that the present application was filed on 10/06/1999 and, therefore, the time periods of 37 CFR § 1.78(a)(2)(ii) for submitting this reference do not apply.

Applicant has amended the paragraph that begins on page 15, line 10, to replace reference numerals "424" with --414-- in three places. This corrects an error so that the HTTP server is consistently identified by reference numerals 414 as found in the first sentence of the paragraph.

#### ***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

3. The Examiner rejects claims 68-71 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Reisman (6594692).

4. Regarding claim 68, applicant has amended claim 68 to include the same elements in the access devices as are found in claim 39, which the Examiner has allowed. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 68 is therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 39.

5.-7. Regarding claims 69-71, applicant relies on the patentability of the claims from which these claims depend to traverse the rejection without prejudice to any further basis for patentability of these claims based on the additional elements recited.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 68-71 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Reisman.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. The Examiner objects to claims 72-77 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but indicates that the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has amended independent claim 71 to include all of the limitations of dependent claim 73 and any intervening dependent claims and cancelled claim 73. Applicant respectfully requests that independent claim 71 and all claims that depend therefrom be allowed.

Applicant presents new independent claim 78 to include all of the limitations of independent claim 71 and dependent claim 72. Dependent claim 79 is identical to dependent claim 73. Applicant respectfully requests that independent claim 79 and all claims that depend therefrom be allowed.

9. Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 39, 40, 50-53, 63-67.

*Conclusion*

Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the applicability of the doctrine of equivalents. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 10/16/2006

By /James Henry/

James Henry  
Reg. No. 41,064  
Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)